DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 644 EC 303 472

TITLE	Demographics of Students Exiting Special Education. Report of the Board of Education, Prepared by the Department of Education, to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. House Document No. 14.
INSTITUTION	Virginia State Dept. of Education, Richmond.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	66p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; *Demography; *Disabilities; *Education Work Relationship; Followup Studies; Individualized Education Programs; Needs Assessment; *Outcomes of Education; Rehabilitation; Secondary Education; *Special Education; State Programs; Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Virginia

ABSTRACT

This study was commissioned by the Virginia State Legislature to provide baseline data on the post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities in Virginia. The study was conducted by an interdisciplinary team including individuals representing five state agencies, local education agencies, parents, and researchers. The study involved an analysis of the 1990-91 Virginia Federal Special Education Child Count report; a statewide follow-up study of 755 special education students who left school in 1990-91; a review of the transition services component of Individualized Education Programs developed in 1992-93 for 238 special education students; and a survey of state agencies' information systems data collection and procedures for youth and young adults with disabilities. Results were similar to those reported in the national literature and illustrate that differing and individualized support systems are needed with disability needs, manner of school exit, and gender all factors influencing program development and priorities. The study concludes that, important for all youth are the need for linkages, the need for information, the need for planning to occur, and the need to begin planning early. Seven primary recommendations focus on the roles of various state agencies (e.g., the Department of Education, the Department of Rehabilitative Services, and local education agencies) in developing effective transition programs. Five appendices include survey instruments and the Resolution authorizing the study. Contains six references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EC

ED 376 644

REPORT OF THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION PREPARED BY THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ON THE

Demographics of Students Exiting Special Education

TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 14

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1994

EC 303472

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. E. Fondriat
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P. O. BOX 2120
RICHMOND 23216-2120

JOSEPH A. SPAGNOLO, JR., Ed.D.
Superintendent of Public Instruction

November 19, 1993

The Honorable Douglas L. Wilder
Governor of Virginia, and
The General Assembly of Virginia
3rd Floor, State Capital
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Governor Wilder and Members of the General Assembly:

The report transmitted herewith is pursuant to House Joint Resolution 4 of the 1992 General Assembly of Virginia. This resolution requested the Department of Education to study the demographics of special education students exiting public schools and report its findings and recommendations to the 1994 session of the General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph A. Spagnolo.

Joseph A. Spagnolo, Jr.
Superintendent of Public Instruction

PREFACE

This legislative study was conducted in response to the 1992 House Joint Resolution #4 requesting a study of the demographics of special education students exiting public schools. An interagency team directed the research and recommendations of this study. The team members included:

- **Department of Education**
  Team Leader: Sharon deFur, Associate Specialist, Special Education/Transition
  Lissa Power-deFur, Principal Specialist, Policy and Planning
  Betsy Grissom, Consultant, Vocational Education Data Management
  Jerry Mathews, Principal Specialist, Information Systems
  Paul Raskopf, Associate Specialist, Program Support
  Larry McCluskey, Lead Specialist, Research
- **Department of Rehabilitative Services**
  Kathy Trossi, Education Unit Program Manager
  Gail Honea, Quality Assurance
- **Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services**
  Michael Fehl, Director, Mental Retardation Children & Youth Services
  Jan McCarthy, Child & Adolescent Associate, Mental Health Services
- **Department for the Visually Handicapped**
  Glen Slonneger, Policy Specialist
- **Department of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing**
  Leslie Hutcheson, Special Projects Manager
- **Parents of youth with disabilities**
  Anita Swan
  Linda McKelvy
- **Local education agencies**
  Dorsey Hiltenbrand, Fairfax County Schools
  Larry Meadors, Franklin County Schools
- **Community Services Boards**
- **University Research Consultants**
  Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
    Susan Asselin, Principal Investigator
    Lawrence Cross
    Phyllis Asbury
  Virginia Commonwealth University
    John Kregel, Principal Investigator
    Liz Getzel

Table of Contents

PREFACE i

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1
Background 1
Study Methodology 2
Summary 3

CHAPTER 2 - IDENTIFICATION OF BASELINE INFORMATION . . 4
Background for Phase I Research 4
Methodology and Findings 4
Implications of Baseline Information 6

CHAPTER 3 - FOLLOW-UP STUDY FINDINGS OF 1990-91 SCHOOL EXITERS 8
Background for Phase II - Study A 8
Methodology 8
Population and Sample 8

Interview Procedures and Data Analysis 11
Findings 11
Employment Outcomes 11
High School experiences related to employment 14
Use of post-school employment services . 15
Postsecondary Education Outcomes 16
Independent Living Outcomes 17
Use of Adult Service Agencies and Post-school Transition Programs 18
Agency Transition Services Needed 19
Implications of Follow-Up Study Findings 20

CHAPTER 4 - REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS' TRANSITION COMPONENTS FOR STUDENTS RECEIVING SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION (SPRING 1993) 23
Background for Phase II - Study B 23
Methodology 24
Findings 25
Participation in Transition Planning 25
Identified Transition Services 25
Employment Plans 25
Education Plans 26
Independent Living Plans 26
Adult Agency Services Identified 26
Implications of the Review of Individual Education Program Transition Components 27

CHAPTER 5 - SURVEY OF SELECTED STATE AGENCIES' INFORMATION SYSTEMS: PROCEDURES OF MAINTAINING AND USING DATA ON INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES . . . 29
Background for Phase II - Study C 29
Sample and Methodology 29
Findings 30
Implications of Survey of State Agencies' Information Systems Findings 31

CHAPTER 6 - CONCLUSIONS 33
Recommendations 36

Tables

Table 1. Demographics of students exiting special education: 1990-91 5

Table 2. Comparisons of respondents and nonrespondents by manner of school exit 10

Table 3. Percentage of young adults with disabilities working (may also be in education program), in education program and not working, and not working/not in education program 12

Appendices

Appendix A - 1992 General Assembly House Joint Resolution #4

Appendix B - Follow-Up Survey Instrument

Appendix C - IEP Review Instrument

Appendix D - State Data Systems Survey

Appendix E - References

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1992 General Assembly House Joint Resolution #4 directed the Virginia Board of Education to conduct a study of the demographics of special education students exiting public education. This legislative study, linked to the Beyer Commission on Sensory and Physical Disabilities, was sponsored by Delegate Joan Munford. Specifically, the resolution asked for the study to develop recommendations for programs and activities to facilitate the transition of youth with disabilities from special education programs to the adult services system; to identify methods of targeting individuals who have vocational potential; to identify methods of targeting individuals who may need long-term rehabilitation services; and to include input from parents of children who receive special education services.

An interdisciplinary team that included individuals representing five state agencies, local education agencies, parents, and researchers developed and carried out the study. Methods included: an analysis of the 1990-91 Virginia Federal Special Education Child Count Report (Table 1); a statewide follow-up study of 755 special education students that left school in 1990-91 (Table 2); a review of the transition services component of Individual Education Programs developed in 1992-93 for 238 students receiving special education; and, a survey of state agencies' information systems data collection and procedures for youth and young adults with disabilities.

This study found that youth and young adults with disabilities in Virginia experience outcomes similar to those reported in the national literature. High drop-out rates plague these students, particularly students with severe emotional disturbance. Youth who drop-out, regardless of disability, face poorer post-school outcomes. While in school, youth who drop-out do not receive the degree of transition services as students who remain in school. Females with disabilities, particularly minority females, are at a high risk for dropping out of school. Youth who drop out of school are less likely to reconnect with the existing service system.

Youth with multiple disabilities and severe retardation frequently remain in school through the maximum age of eligibility (age 22). These youth face the greatest barriers to employment, housing, transportation and independent living upon school exit. Many of these individuals do not receive transition services directed to these areas while in school or upon school exit.

About 75% of the young adults with disabilities held jobs at some time since school exit, but only 57% were employed (range = 37% to 74%) at the time of the survey (Table 3). Most of the jobs were part-time and few paid more than minimum wage. Students with multiple and severe disabilities (54%), mental retardation (45%) and students with serious emotional disturbance (49%) encounter the highest rates of unemployment or lack of involvement in postsecondary education or training. Most young adults who were employed found jobs on their own or with the help of family and friends and did not use the available adult services in finding employment.

Little comparative data are available for the general non-disabled population. The Virginia Vocational Education Student Follow-up of 1991 Vocational Education Program Completers provides some comparisons. That study found that 70% of the vocational completer respondents were employed or in the military, 20% were in school full time, and 10% were not employed or in school. The average wage for these young adults was above minimum wage with more individuals employed full time than part time. In comparison, youth with disabilities encounter poorer employment outcomes in terms of employment rates, hours, and wages.

Youth and young adults with disabilities in Virginia do participate in postsecondary education programs at higher rates than reported in other areas of the country. In fact, community college participation is similar to that projected by the general population. Retention of young adults with disabilities in postsecondary education programs is a concern. These young adults with disabilities do not consistently access the support services available within postsecondary education settings that would assist in successful completion of programs.

Efforts to implement consistent statewide transition planning for youth with disabilities are underway across the Commonwealth. However, linkages between school and adult services to foster an uninterrupted transition are not fully established. Youth and young adults do not access post-school supports or services at high rates. In addition, projections of anticipated service needs, systematic data exchange between agencies, and long range planning for service provision are not yet common practice across service providers. Consequently, gaps exist between needed services and available services.

Secondary and postsecondary transition service provision remains somewhat fragmented across Virginia with multiple providers offering services with differing eligibility criteria. Understanding and accessing the system present challenges. In addition, stakeholders such as employers and

other community members have a role in facilitating the transition to employment or independent living. Efforts to create a collaborative community process to develop and improve the system and its services are critical.

School to work transition is an initiative that is now gaining emphasis within general and vocational education. The proposed process of integrating academics, work based learning, and creating connections between these components and the world of work parallels the transition initiative for youth and young adults with disabilities. It is imperative that Virginia's transition system evolve together where the identification of needed supports for youth with disabilities becomes integral to the total system.

This report provides baseline data for the Commonwealth on the post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities. The results illustrate that differing and individualized supports will be needed. Disability needs, manner of school exit, and gender are factors that may influence program development and priorities. Common elements for all youth include the need for linkages, the need for information, the need for planning to occur, and the need to begin planning early.

Seven primary recommendations emerge from these findings. Sub-recommendations are found in Chapter 6.

I: The Department of Education should recommend amending the Standards of Quality to clarify the responsibilities of local education agencies in the development of transition plans for students eligible for special education, and in the establishment of the necessary linkages with all participating agencies.

II: The Department of Rehabilitative Services (DRS) in cooperation with the Department of Education (DOE) should evaluate model local cooperative agreements for transition services. The effectiveness of these agreements in promoting coordinated transition services for youth with disabilities should be reported to the heads of each of these respective agencies.

III: Proposed efforts to develop a School to Work transition system for all students in the Commonwealth should be coordinated with current efforts to develop a transition services system for youth with disabilities by Virginia's Intercommunity Transition Council through Project UNITE. State efforts in this regard include: recommendations of the 1993 Department of Education legislative study (SJR #183) on School to Work Transition Programs; an interagency application for funding of a development grant under the proposed federal School to Work

Opportunities Act; and recommendations of the Virginia Workforce Leadership Council. Adequate resources to provide the programs and supports needed for youth with disabilities should be provided.

IV: The Department of Education should evaluate the effectiveness of early transition planning and services for youth with disabilities as a drop-out prevention strategy.

V: The Board of Education should establish a study group consisting of representatives from the State Council on Higher Education, Virginia Community College System, secondary school counselors, the Department of Education and local education agencies, and the Department of Rehabilitative Services, as well as students with disabilities participating in postsecondary education to identify and recommend programs and strategies to increase the success of young adults with disabilities in postsecondary education programs.

VI: The Department of Education should create an interagency work group to develop and evaluate a system of data collection and information exchange that promotes the provision of quality data to project postsecondary transition service needs for youth and young adults with disabilities.

VII: The Board of Education, the Department of Education, and all Local Education Agencies should solicit information from consumers and families concerning the effectiveness of secondary transition programs and services for youth with disabilities.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

The 1992 General Assembly House Joint Resolution #4 directed the Virginia Board of Education to conduct a study of the demographics of special education students exiting education in Virginia. The resolution instructed the Board of Education to: develop recommendations for programs and activities to facilitate the transition of youth with disabilities from special education programs to the adult services system; identify methods of targeting individuals who have vocational potential; identify methods of targeting individuals who may need long-term rehabilitation services; and to include input from parents of children who receive special education services.

The impetus for this study was based on a recommendation by the Beyer Commission for Children and Youth with Physical and Sensory Disabilities. This commission identified that many of the transition service needs for the population of young adults with sensory and physical disabilities were not being met.

Nationally, follow-up studies indicate that youth and young adults with disabilities face more obstacles to independence than their nondisabled peers (Wagner, 1989). Consistently, studies show that these youth and young adults face higher rates of unemployment and underemployment and lower rates of participation in postsecondary education or training. In general, the more severe the disability, the more pronounced the discrepancy from the general population. In addition, longitudinal data show that youth with disabilities who drop out of school experience ongoing and pronounced difficulties with employment and further education. No baseline data describing post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities in Virginia existed prior to this study.

Virginia receives credit as a national leader in the area of developing transition programs for youth with disabilities. For example, the Departments of Education and Rehabilitative Services have been partners in numerous model programs and continue to cooperatively offer vocational evaluation and planning services through the Postsecondary Education Rehabilitation and Transition Program (PERT) for approximately 500 youth each year. At present, these agencies also direct Project UNITE, a five year federal project to implement and improve the transition services system in Virginia. Virginia's Intercommunity Transition Council, comprised of 13

state agencies, works to coordinate services statewide and to identify statewide systemic needs and strategies. In addition, many localities have developed transition services programs. Virginia Institutes of Higher Education are increasingly offering training programs for service providers as well as operating research and model programs.

In 1990, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) amended the Education of the Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142). These amendments added components identifying transition services and transition planning requirements for youth with disabilities receiving special education. Transition services are defined as "a coordinated set of activities for students, designed within an outcome-oriented process, which promotes movement from school to post-school activities, including postsecondary education, vocational training, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, and community participation" (Sec. 602(a)(19)). In addition, Individualized Education Programs for students receiving special education must now include a "statement of the needed transition services for students beginning no later than age 16, and younger when appropriate, including when appropriate, a statement of the interagency responsibilities or linkages (or both) before the student leaves the school setting" (Sec.602(a)(20)(D)).

Study Methodology

In response to the requests of House Joint Resolution #4, a two phase study was conducted. Phase I research identified the baseline demographics of students with disabilities exiting secondary special education in Virginia's schools through an analysis of the Virginia special education 1990-91 child count federal report for special education student exit demographics. Chapter 2 provides a complete description of Phase I and the findings.

Phase II research collected data that would disclose the post-school outcomes of students with disabilities who received special education in Virginia; secondly, investigations in this phase collected information to suggest recommendations that would improve or establish practices that assist youth with disabilities to make successful transitions from school to post-school environments. Three separate data collection efforts occurred to accomplish this purpose. For the purposes of this report, we will refer to these studies as A, B, & C. Stakeholders, including parents of youth with disabilities, as members of an interdisciplinary team, advised

and influenced the data collection efforts of research consultants in each of the studies of Phase II.

In Study A, a sample of special education students who exited school in 1990-91 were interviewed by phone using a standardized survey. The survey questions were designed to identify employment rates and earnings; participation in post-secondary education; independent living status; and, access to adult services. In addition, questions were asked to determine the high school experiences of these students that might impact their postsecondary status. Chapter 3 provides a complete description of Study A, the findings, and the implications for education and adult services.

In Study B, individualized education programs transition plans of secondary special education students in selected school divisions from the 1992-93 school year were reviewed. The intention was to attempt to identify planning practices that promote successful transitions and to identify projected transition services that were being recommended in this planning process. Chapter 4 provides a complete description of Study B, the findings, and the implications for transition planning efforts in the Commonwealth.

In Study C, state agencies were surveyed to identify current methods of maintaining and using data on individuals with disabilities. The questions this survey attempted to address were: how interagency service planning and service needs projection activities occur; whether potential sources of program evaluation exist within current data collection systems; and,what is the capability for interfacing current systems for long range tracking of student outcomes. Chapter 5 describes Study C and the implications for agency data systems and exchange of information regarding youth with disabilities.

Summary

This study provides an opportunity to evaluate the impact of the past efforts to improve postsecondary transition outcomes for youth with disabilities. It also enables Virginia to establish a baseline to evaluate future efforts in implementing new programs and policies. These data will also identify those areas where increased resources and systemic changes are needed. It is believed that these data will assist state and local agencies and other organizations that provide services to youth and young adults with disabilities to set priorities and service delivery agendas for the upcoming years.

CHAPTER 2 - IDENTIFICATION OF BASELINE INFORMATION

Background for Phase I Research

Virginia prepares an annual special education report for the United States Department of Education (USDOE). One component of that report is the identification of school exit status for adolescents receiving special education, ages 14 and older. Information from local education agencies is aggregated and reported by federal disability categories. Reports are made based on the total number of special education students who: received diplomas; received a special diploma or certificate; officially withdrew from school (drop-out); had an unknown exit status (most likely, unofficial drop-outs); and, reached the maximum age of school eligibility (in Virginia, 21 inclusive). The USDOE then aggregates these data across states and prepares a report to Congress.

Nationally, aggregated reports of this nature find that: 45% of students with disabilities exit school with a diploma; 13% receive a special diploma or certificate; 27% officially drop out of school; 13% are classified as status unknown; and 2% stay in school until they reach the maximum age of eligibility (United States Department of Education, 1992). Nationally, students classified with primary learning disabilities, hearing impairments, orthopedic impairments, and visual impairments receive diplomas at a higher rate (more than 50%) receiving diplomas than do students with other disability classifications.

Methodology and Findings

For this study, the 1990-91 Virginia Special Education child count school exit reports were analyzed by disability and manner of school exit (Table 1). In 1990-91, 3,801 or 13% of students receiving special education, ages 14-22, exited Virginia's schools. The average age at school exit was 19 whereas the average age for "drop out" (official withdrawal) was 18. The age range for dropping out was 14-20 years of age.

- 60 percent of those youth who exited Virginia's schools in 1990-91 received a standard or academic diploma;
- 12 percent exited school with a certificate of completion or a special individualized education plan diploma;
- 15 percent officially dropped-out of school;
- 11 percent were classified as "status unknown" (may reflect percentage of unofficial drop-outs), and;
- 2 percent of all students eligible for special education remained in school until the maximum age of eligibility in Virginia (age 22).

Table 1.
Demographics of Virginia students exiting special education: 1990-91
(U.S. Department of Education Virginia Child Count Report)

Disability	Diploma	IEP Diploma/ Certificate	Drop-Out	Status Unknown	Maximum Age (22)
Specific Learning Disability (n = 2466)	72%	5%	14%	9%	<1%
Mental Retardation (n = 667)	30%	41%	14%	9%	5%
Serious Emotional Disturbance (n = 475)	46%	8%	24%	22%	1%
Speech Language Impairment (n = 58)	76%	0%	5%	19%	0%
Multiple Disabilities (n = 43)	21%	16%	0%	5%	58%
Visual Impairment (n = 28)	93%	0%	3.5%	3.5%	0%
Hard of Hearing or Deaf (n = 30)	73%	10%	0%	13%	3%
Other Health Impairments (n = 23)	74%	13%	9%	4%	0%
Orthopedic Impairments (n = 10)	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%

NOTE: The percentages reported in Table 1 were calculated as a ratio based on the number of special education students from that disability category that exited Virginia's schools in 1990-91.

NOTE: At the time of this federal report, categorical data were not maintained for children and youth with autism or with traumatic brain injury. Consequently, there are not baseline demographics for youth from these disability areas. Data will be reported for these disability areas for future federal reports.

Of the special education students who exit school each year, at least 1/4 exit without completing an academic or vocational program. Students with serious emotional disturbance (24% official drop-out; 22% status unknown (presumed drop-out)) are at the highest risk of exiting school prior to completion of any program.

Students with visual impairments (93%) and students with orthopedic impairments (90%) complete school at a similar manner as the general population, that is, they earn a diploma. Approximately 75% of students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, speech language impairments, or who are deaf or hard of hearing receive a standard or academic diploma.

Forty percent of students with mental retardation are granted a special diploma or certificate of completion, but exit school prior to their maximum age of eligibility (age 22). Students with complex and multiple disabilities tend to remain in school throughout the time of eligibility for Free and Appropriate Public Education (age 22).

Implications of Baseline Information

In Virginia, many students with disabilities exit school prior to completing either an academic or vocational course of study. In all likelihood, many of these individuals will face serious barriers to achieving independence and full participation into the community. Students with severe emotional disturbance are at an extremely high risk of school drop out. Priority attention must be given to programs that enable these students to complete their education either in traditional or alternative settings.

Virginia's schools must be prepared to address the complex transition needs of those students remaining in school through the eligibility age of 22. Linkages with adult services, independent living and employment, are particularly critical to those young adults with complex and multiple disabilities.

Many students with disabilities are completing school with a diploma and will be, in all likelihood, entering Virginia's post-school education or training programs or the workforce. These systems must be poised to receive these young adults and to provide the services they will need to be successful in these settings.

As a whole, the school exit statistics for students with disabilities in Virginia reflect higher rates of earned diplomas and lower drop-out rates than what is seen nationally. The history of Virginia's schools as having high expectations for ALL students as well as providing appropriate educational services for children and youth with disabilities can assume some credit for these outcomes. Nonetheless, concerns remain. Annually, we see data that demonstrate the high risk for youth with disabilities of not completing school with adequate employment or independent living skills. It is critical that we examine these data and evaluate the impact of programs on increasing school completion and acquisition of skills for these youth if they are going to be able to compete in the increasingly complex work world of the future.

CHAPTER 3 - FOLLOW-UP STUDY FINDINGS OF 1990-91 SCHOOL EXITERS

Background for Phase II - Study A

Beginning in 1975, with the passage of the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA), no student with a disability could be denied access to a free and appropriate public education. Access to education is viewed as a primary tool for becoming a productive citizen in a free nation. Now, in 1993, we have reached a time when a generation of free and appropriately educated special education students are exiting public schools. The question remains as to whether the quality of their education has been substantial enough to enable these young adults with disabilities to experience postschool success. We must also consider that postschool success may depend on access to needed adult services and whether or not the systemic changes that foster community integration have occurred. Care must also be taken not to have the expectations for success for young adults with disabilities exceed or be lower than the expectations for young adults without disabilities.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the postschool status of youth and young adults with disabilities who exit Virginia's schools. Postsecondary status in the areas of employment, independent living, and further education was explored. In addition, access and use of secondary and postsecondary transition services were identified.

Methodology

Survey development, research design, and primary analyses were conducted by a research team at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The legislative study team served as stakeholders for the researchers and provided input into the research questions, research design, survey design, and data analyses.

Population and Sample

The sample was drawn from the 3,801 students who exited Virginia's schools in 1990-91. Students whose school exit status was unknown were excluded from the sample. A random sample was generated for students who were classified as having primary learning disabilities, mental retardation or emotional disturbance. All students classified as having

severe mental retardation were included in the sample. For the remainder of the disability category areas, attempts were made to contact all students. Consequently, the percentage of students from typically low incidence disabilities in this sample is slightly higher than the actual percentage found in the total population of special education school exiters. Students with disabilities who did not receive special education were not included in this sample as no organized system currently exists to identify these students.

Seven hundred fifty-five (755) special education school exiters comprised the sample population for the follow-up study. Of these, completed interviews were obtained for 486 young adults. These respondents came from all geographic areas of the Commonwealth, representing 90 local education agencies and 2 state operated programs.

Seventy-three percent of respondents were Caucasian, 22% African-American, and 5% represented other ethnic groups. Sixty-six percent (66%) were male, 34% percent female. Of these 486 young adults, 68% received a diploma, 16% received a certificate of completion, 7% reached the maximum age of public school eligibility, and 9% dropped-out of school. Students whose status was unknown were not included in this sample.

Although the demographics of the respondents approximated those of the total special education population, the respondent sample is somewhat skewed in favor of school completers. Compared to the demographics of the nonrespondents (Table 2), this is very apparent. Also, the sample of nonrespondents contained a higher percentage of males and a higher percentage of minorities. Therefore, the results must be viewed accordingly and care taken regarding generalizability. Of the nonrespondents, 76% could not be located, 9% refused to participate, 4% were in correctional facilities, and 4% were deceased.

NOTE: Three students with autism exited school in 1990-91. Data were obtained on 2 students, an insufficient number to be included in this analysis. Case studies are available for these students.

Table 2. Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents by manner of school exit

Disability	DIPLOMA	CERTIFICATE SPECIAL DIPLOMA	REACHED MAXIMUM AGE OF ELIGIBILITY	DROP-OUT
Hard of Hearing respondents (n=24)	88%	12%	0%	0%
Hard of Hearing nonrespondents (n=18)	79%	16%	0%	5%
Visual Impairments respondents (n=25)	92%	4%	0%	4%
Visual Impairments nonrespondents (n=12)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Speech Language Impairment respondents (n=28)	96%	0%	0%	3%
Speech Language Impairment nonrespondents (n=18)	94%	0%	0%	5%
Orthopedic Impairment/ Other Health Impairment respondents (n=19)	84%	0%	5%	10%
Orthopedic Impairment/Other Health Impairment nonrespondents (n=9)	67%	22%	0%	11%
Specific Learning Disability respondents (n=186)	86%	5%	0%	9%
Specific Learning Disability nonrespondents (n=96)	66%	6%	0%	27%
Serious Emotional Disturbance respondents (n=79)	65%	10%	3%	22%
Serious Emotional Disturbance non-respondents (n=37)	46%	8%	0%	44%
Mental Retardation respondents (n=77)	27%	57%	9%	6%
Mental Retardation nonrespondents (n=31)	33%	39%	9%	12%
Multiple Disabilities/ Severe Profound Retardation respondents (n=48)	21%	31%	42%	4%
Multiple Disabilities/ Severe Profound Retardation nonrespondents (n=27)	19%	33%	41%	7%

Interview Procedures and Data Analysis

Former students who exited school in 1990-91 or their parents responded to a telephone interview conducted by local teachers or administrators during March, April and May of 1993. Local educators were chosen to conduct the interviews in an effort to obtain a greater likelihood of response. Interviewers were provided training on the survey instrument (Appendix B) via a teleconference with an accompanying training and reference manual. Ongoing technical assistance was provided to the interviewers by the researchers. Interviewers were paid $10.00 per completed interview as well as phone expenses for long distance calls.

All follow-up studies and research designs have accompanying limitations. The limitations of this study include data based on self-reporting, a lengthy interview process, multiple interviewers, a respondent group in favor of school completers, and a complex service delivery system that makes distinguishing services or service providers difficult for consumers. Nonetheless, these data are believed to accurately reflect the trends experienced by youth with disabilities exiting Virginia's schools.

Findings

Employment Outcomes

National data show that young adults with disabilities encounter difficulty locating and maintaining employment during the transition years. The more complex and severe the disability, the greater the challenge to finding and maintaining employment. In addition, national follow-up studies show that adolescents with disabilities who drop out of school face increasing difficulties in finding and maintaining employment and that particularly for these individuals, the post school employment picture grows worse with time.

Many of the young adults with disabilities who left Virginia's schools in 1990-91 have worked in some capacity since school exit (75%). At the time of this study, from 37% to 74% of respondents were employed (rates of employment varied greatly depending on disability (Table 3). Those employed tended to be working part-time (less than 40 hours per week) and in jobs paying minimum wage or less. About half of those working had changed jobs more than three times since leaving school two years earlier.

Unemployment varies among these young adults with disabilities; respondents with severe retardation or multiple disabilities were the least likely to be working or going to school (54%); similar findings were noted for respondents with mental retardation (45%) or serious emotional disturbance (42%). On the other hand, respondents with specific learning disabilities were the most likely to be working (74%) (Table 3).

Respondents who were not working and not in postsecondary education programs most often cited "inability to find a job" as a reason for not being employed. Most of the working young adults participating in this study report that they were satisfied with their current job.

Table 3. Percentage of young adults with disabilities working (may also be in education program), in education program and not working, and not working/not in education program 18 months post school exit

DISABILITY	EMPLOYED PART-TIME OR FULL-TIME	IN EDUCATION PROGRAM/ NOT WORKING	NOT WORKING/NOT IN EDUCATION PROGRAM
Deaf or Hard of Hearing (n = 24)	38%	29%	33%
Visual Impairments or Blindness (n = 25)	40%	28%	32%
Speech Language Impairments (n = 28)	54%	29%	17%
Other Health Impairment or Orthopedic Impairment (n = 19)	37%	26%	37%
Specific Learning Disability (n = 186)	74%	9%	17%
Serious Emotional Disturbance (n = 79)	57%	1%	42%
Mild or Moderate Mental Retardation (n = 77)	48%	7%	45%
Multiple Disabilities or Severe Profound Retardation (n = 48)	40%	6%	54%

Approximately 38% of young adults with primary physical or sensory impairments are working 18 months after leaving school. Most of the jobs are part-time (less than 40 hours per week); wages vary with about half reporting wages at or below minimum wage. About half of those that are not working are going to school. Of those young adults with sensory impairments who were not either working or going to school, the major reason cited was "cannot find a job".

Forty percent (40%) of young adults with severe profound retardation or with multiple disabilities report working two years after leaving school. Most of these young adults are working part-time and very few earn more than minimum wage; the majority of those working earn less than minimum wage. A small number of those who are not working are going to school. Reasons cited for not working by these young adults include health, lack of skills, cannot find a job.

Forty percent (40%) of young adults with mild or moderate retardation are working two years after leaving school. About two out of five of those working work less than 30 hours per week. About two thirds of those working young adults with mild or moderate mental retardation earn minimum wage or less. Very few (less than 10%) of these adults report not working due to going to school. Cannot find a job, lack of skills, health, lack of transportation as well as not wanting to work were among the reasons cited for not working.

Fifty-seven percent (57%) of young adults with serious emotional disturbance are working two years after leaving school. The majority of these working young adults are working less than 40 hours per week, with 40% working less than 30 hours per week. About 40% of those working young adults with serious emotional disturbance report earning minimum wage or less. Very few of these young adults who are not working are going to school. Lack of skills, lack of child care, cannot find a job, health and being fired or laid off were reasons cited for not working.

Seventy-four percent (74%) of young adult respondents with learning disabilities are working two years after leaving school. Most respondents (50%) with learning disabilities report working between 31-39 hours per week; 25% work less than 30 hours per week. About 60% of working young adults with learning disabilities report earning minimum wage or less. About one third of those who are not working are going to school. Lack of skills, transportation, and job availability are factors influencing those young adults who are not working.

The largest number of drop-outs with disabilities are concentrated in the cohort of youth with serious emotional disturbance, specific learning disabilities, and mental retardation. Thirty-three percent (33%) of those respondents who dropped out of school had held no jobs since school exit compared to 17% of those with diplomas. Although a higher percentage of drop-outs (30%) than diploma graduates (17%) held full-time jobs, only 31% made more than minimum wage compared with 41% of diploma graduates. Forty-three percent (43%) of drop-outs were not working; 15% of these individuals were in school. Those young adults who had dropped out of school and were currently not working and not in school cited inability to find a job as a primary factor influencing job status. Drop-outs who were working were less satisfied (64%) with their job than graduates who were working (82%).

The largest concentration of individuals who remain in school through the maximum age of eligibility are concentrated in the cohort of youth with multiple or severe disabilities or mental retardation. Seventy-five percent of these young adult respondents entered sheltered workshops upon school exit. Only 20% entered supported employment in integrated settings.

High School experiences related to employment

Very few young adults with severe profound retardation or with multiple disabilities held jobs during high school. Of those few who did work, school counselors or teachers were instrumental in their obtaining employment. Only 31% of these respondents participated in any vocational classes. The most commonly used transition service by youth with severe disabilities was vocational assessment (48%); less than one third received career counseling, work adjustment, job coaching, or work release services.

About half of respondents with mild or moderate mental retardation report working during high school. These young adults were assisted in obtaining employment by school personnel while in high school. About one third of these respondents had participated in vocational classes while two thirds received a vocational assessment. About 33% had the services of a job coach while in school.

More than half of the respondents with physical or sensory impairments held jobs during high school. Most of these jobs were in service occupations; teachers and counselors assisted in locating these jobs for about half of those who worked. Seventy-three percent (73%) of respondents who were deaf or hard of hearing participated in vocational

classes in high school while less than half of respondents who have visual impairments, orthopedic impairments, or other health impairments participated in vocational classes. Vocational assessment was the transition service most commonly used.

Sixty-six percent (66%) of respondents with serious emotional disturbance report working during high school. Of those who worked, almost all of them report not having assistance by school personnel. About 60% of respondents with serious emotional disturbance participated in vocational classes and received a vocational assessment; 19% participated in work adjustment programs.

Seventy-five percent of respondents with learning disabilities report having worked during high school. Few reported being assisted by school personnel in obtaining jobs while in high school. About 60% of these respondents received a vocational assessment and 60% participated in vocational classes in high school.

Very few respondents (7%) reported that school counselors or vocational teachers assisted them in finding a job upon school exit.

Most respondents who completed school with a diploma reported that post-school plans were discussed prior to school exit (77%); this occurred somewhat less often for respondents who left school with a special diploma or certificate of completion (60%). However, only 33% of respondents who had dropped out of school reported having discussed plans with anyone during their high school career. Respondents who dropped out of school participated in vocational classes (50%), but to a somewhat lesser degree than students who received diplomas (60%) or certificates of completion (64%). Respondents who dropped out of school reported lesser usage of all in-school transition services (vocational assessment, work adjustment, career counseling, on the job training, job coaches, work release, vocational classes, identified career objectives, etc.) than respondents who remained in school through completion.

Use of post-school employment services

Almost all of the young adult respondents (80%) who are working or have worked since leaving school found their post-school job by themselves or with the help of family or friends. Less than 20% of these young adults reported receiving help in finding a job from adult service agencies or

from school personnel. Relatively more young adults with mild, moderate or severe retardation and young adults with multiple disabilities reported receiving assistance in finding a job through adult service agencies. They either used the Department of Rehabilitative Services or the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services. Only seven of the 486 young adult respondents reported using the Virginia Employment Commission or Job Training Partnership Act programs for job placement. Interestingly, the cohort of youth with disabilities who received employment support services while in high school seemed to be the same group of young adults that accessed post-school employment services.

Postsecondary Education Outcomes

National follow-up studies indicate that only 16% of all youth with disabilities participate in postsecondary education (two or four year colleges) or vocational training programs. By law, postsecondary education institutions may not make discriminatory admissions decisions on the basis of disability if applicants are otherwise qualified for admission. Furthermore, these institutions must make reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities to participate in all programs offered at the institution. Unlike public education, students must independently request accommodations and support services offered through these institutions.

Most young adults with disabilities from Virginia schools who participate in postsecondary education or training do so in a community college or in a four year college. Thirty-three percent of respondents reported having attended a community college (21%) or a four year college (12%) in the past two years. This rate of attendance is similar to the identified intentions of the general population for community college, but less than those identified for attending four year colleges (Superintendent's Annual Report for Virginia, 1990-91).

At the time of the interviews, relatively few young adults with disabilities were in school full time (Table 3). However, many youth with disabilities had participated in some degree of postsecondary education during the previous 18 months since school exit. Few respondents with disabilities reported accessing support services while participating in any post-secondary training program; tutoring was the most frequently accessed support service across disabilities. Students with sensory disabilities were the most likely to access post-secondary support services. The post-secondary

education participation rate since school exit for the various disability areas are as follows [participation means taking one or more courses]:

- 75% of the respondents who are deaf or hard of hearing.
- 60% of the respondents who have other health impairments or orthopedic impairments.
- 50% of the respondents who have visual impairments.
- 40% of the respondents who have learning disabilities.
- 25% of the respondents who have serious emotional disturbance.
- A few respondents with mental retardation or with multiple disabilities also participate in postsecondary education programs.

About 9% of the respondents reported that they participated in vocational training programs or on the job training programs. Most of these participants were respondents with learning disabilities. Only four respondents participated in apprenticeship programs. These four received a diploma before entering apprenticeships. It is encouraging to note that about 33% of the respondents who dropped out of school had participated in adult education programs. National longitudinal follow up data indicate that, over time, some youth with disabilities do re-enter postsecondary education programs although the re-entry of drop-outs remains low (Wagner, 1993).

A few respondents named supported employment or attending a rehabilitation center as their postsecondary training program. These respondents were primarily young adults with mild or moderation retardation. Sheltered workshops are named as a postsecondary training program for young adults with mild or moderate mental retardation, severe mental retardation, and multiple disabilities.

Independent Living Outcomes

National follow-up studies and demographics suggest that youth and young adults with disabilities do not participate in the community nor establish independent lives within the first three to five years after public school. This is particularly true for young adult with severe disabilities.

Likewise, most young adults with disabilities in Virginia continue to live with their family 18 months after school exit. Very few of the respondents reported living in group homes. Eight percent (8%) of the respondents were married and 10% report having children.

Recreation and leisure activities include spending time with family and friends, watching television, attending sporting events, etc.; young adults with more severe retardation or with multiple disabilities seem to be somewhat less involved in community activities for recreation and leisure.

School completion with a diploma proved to be a positive factor influencing independent living outcomes for these young adults. For example, about half of the respondents were registered to vote. However, diploma recipients were more likely to be registered voters whereas drop-outs were the least likely to be registered.

About 66% of the respondents were licensed to drive. Ten percent (10%) report dependency on public transportation (public bus service or special van services). Again, respondents who graduated with a diploma were almost twice as likely to have a drivers license than respondents who had dropped out of school.

Respondents who had dropped out of school were more likely to use Medicaid, food stamps, and general relief social services than respondents who graduated from school with a diploma, certificate, or by reaching the maximum age of eligibility. Drop-outs were more likely to be involved with correctional education. They were more likely to have children and less likely to have used the services of adult agencies other than social services.

Use of Adult Service Agencies and Post-school Transition Programs

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, public schools must offer transition planning, instruction, and community experiences to adolescents with disabilities to assist in the transition from high school to young adult independence. Post-school transition services are most often offered through linkages with adult service agencies. Multiple adult agencies offer services depending on the disability and the service needed. To receive services, young adults with disabilities or their families must seek these services and be determined eligible for services.

Around half of the young adults surveyed with sensory or physical disabilities, with mild or moderate retardation, or with severe or multiple disabilities reported using adult agency services. Agencies accessed since school exit included

the Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing(DDHH), the Department of the Visually Handicapped(DVH), the Department of Rehabilitative Services(DRS), the and Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services (DMHMRSAS). For the most part, respondents who received services from these agencies found the assistance useful.

The Department of Social Services(DSS) was also used by a number of respondents. Ten percent (10%) of young adults with learning disabilities accessed this service, while 33% of young adults with mild, moderate, or severe retardation, or multiple disabilities accessed the services of this agency. Again, most respondents who received services from DSS found the assistance useful.

Very few young adults with disabilities had used post-school transition services 18 months after school exit. Across disabilities, the local library was one of the most frequently accessed community services and almost all respondents who used the library found the services useful.

Vocational counseling and vocational assessment were among services used by some respondents (less than 20%) from each of the disability areas. These services were viewed favorably by those who used them.

Supported employment was most frequently used by young adults with mild or moderate retardation or with severe or multiple disabilities. Yet, less than 20% of these respondents had accessed this service. Of those who had accessed supported employment, 100% found this service useful.

Agency Transition Services Needed

National needs assessments often report that people with disabilities and their families are frustrated by the lack of services or the inability to access services. Frequently, the services needed include housing, transportation, job placement, job counseling, and financial support. It has been suggested that many young adults with disabilities prefer to attempt independence without seeking support, a characteristic common to many young adults in this transition phase.

Many respondents did not identify that assistance was needed in their present lives. Of those who did identify needed transition services, the most frequently requested were:

- vocational counseling;
- vocational assessment;
- financial counseling;
- employment services;
- supported employment;
- jobs hotline;
- group home (primarily for multiple and complex disabilities);
- medicaid.

Most respondents did not identify a need for services from a particular adult service agency. Typically, services were needed from those agencies offering specific services to a specific disability group (e.g. respondents with visual impairments indicated a need for services from DVH). It is of note here that 54% of the respondents with multiple disabilities or severe retardation reported not using services for individuals with mental retardation through Community Service Boards while 29% of these respondents identified that they needed services from the department serving individuals with mental retardation.

Implications of Follow-Up Study Findings

Relatively few young adults with disabilities are using adult services to assist them in accessing employment, increasing independent living options, or succeeding in postsecondary education. Interestingly, many of these young adults do not report that they think they need these services. In contrast, many of these young adults received transition services while in high school and viewed these services very positively. It is not clear why these post-school linkages are not occurring.

As a group, those individuals with disabilities who are linked with a human service agencies at early ages tend to maintain that linkage into young adulthood. For example, individuals with sensory impairments are often registered with the DDHH and DVH as children and these youth and young adults tended to continue to access these services as needed as young adults. It is possible that early linkage facilitates the use of these services. Perhaps, we will see similar results of the early linkage that occurs with the early intervention programs initiated in 1987 or with the Virginia Comprehensive Services Act that is currently being implemented for youth at risk. For those youth that "fall between the cracks" of clear eligibility for these services, it will be important for the transition plan to clearly identify potential linkages that can assist these youth in attaining successful post-secondary

outcomes.

Youth with disabilities who remain in school are offered a variety of transition services while in school. Across disabilities, participation in vocational assessment and in vocational classes are the most common transition services used by these youth. Of those who did not use these services, in retrospect, many young adults perceived these services as having been needed. Work adjustment programs are accessed by relatively few of these youth.

In general, youth and young adults with disabilities who find employment while in school or after school exit find their jobs on their own or with the help of family and friends. Teachers, counselors, adult service personnel assist only a relative few of these individuals in job seeking or job keeping. Those that are assisted with employment while in high school and make the necessary post-school linkages seem to be more likely to be employed in some capacity.

Across disabilities, the picture for those students who drop out of school, is bleak. These students do not access transition services while in school, even fewer linkages are established for them post-school, and they face significant employment and education barriers. They are more likely to have families, receive social assistance, and be involved with the court system. Of particular note, is that young girls with disabilities face a high risk of dropping out of school. Furthermore, minority females with disabilities seem to be among the least likely to acquire diplomas.

Virginia youth with disabilities are accessing postsecondary education programs in community colleges and four year colleges. These youth are not consistently accessing the support services offered through these institutions. It is unclear as to whether this is due to personal choice, lack of information concerning the services, or a lack of services at the postsecondary level. Nonetheless, retention of young adults with disabilities in these education programs might be higher if these services were used.

Young adults with multiple disabilities or severe retardation face many barriers to employment, housing, transportation and independent living. Many of these individuals do not receive transition services directed to these areas while in school or upon school exit.

Youth and young adults with serious emotional disturbance

are more likely to drop out of school, more likely to make low wages, and less likely to participate or remain in postsecondary education programs than most of their peers from other disability areas. In addition, they seem unlikely to access adult services or education support services.

Youth with mental retardation receive support in job placement while in high school. Likewise, they are more likely to access similar supports from adult service agencies upon school exit. In spite of this, employment remains a barrier for many of these young adults.

Youth with specific learning disabilities and speech language impairments achieve the post-school outcomes of employment and participation in postsecondary education at higher rates than their peers with other disabilities. Nonetheless, young adults with specific learning disabilities continue to encounter greater challenges in the areas of employment and postsecondary education than their nondisabled peers.

Youth with sensory and physical impairments participate in postsecondary education at a higher rate than their peers from other disability areas. Though these data are encouraging, many of these young adults are not working.

Compared with national statistics, the post-school status of former special education students in Virginia is somewhat brighter, particularly in their rate of participation in postsecondary education. Nonetheless, these data suggest that improved educational efforts, adult service efforts, and community efforts are needed if we are to realize the goal of full community participation as productive adults for young adults with disabilities.

CHAPTER 4 - REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS' TRANSITION COMPONENTS FOR STUDENTS RECEIVING SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION (SPRING 1993)

Background for Phase II - Study B

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 (IDEA) specified that all students receiving special education shall have transition services addressed within their Individual Education Program (IEP) no later than by age 16. The federal regulations governing this act were issued in the fall of 1992. State special education regulations have been revised during 1993 to be consistent with the federal regulations regarding transition services. Virginia school divisions have been in the process of developing transition policies and practice in compliance with these requirements.

Many school divisions in Virginia developed transition plans for students prior to the passage of the IDEA legislation. However, prior to the IDEA, few localities were including transition specifically on student's IEPs. The intent of the transition legislation and regulations is twofold: one, to ensure that young adults with disabilities are prepared with the necessary academic and vocational skills for post-school success; and two, that the necessary linkages with the adult service system are made to facilitate these young adults full integration into the adult community.

The IDEA regulations now require that students be present at the IEP where transition plans are being discussed and that adult service personnel be invited to participate in the meeting if it is likely that they may be involved in the transition service provision. Virginia's vocational education regulations require that vocational education staff be involved in the development of IEPs for those students who will require accommodations or modification of their vocational education program.

The IDEA regulations also now require that the IEP address employment objectives, adult living objectives, instruction and needed community experiences for students. The IDEA regulations were in the process of being implemented while this study was being conducted and in all likelihood have not yet been fully implemented in all Virginia schools.

Virginia does not require a uniform model for use in

Individualized Education Programs; likewise, the content and extent of information in IEPs varies with each locality. In addition, federal regulations governing the transition components in IEPs were only issued in the Fall of 1992. Therefore, the components outlined in the regulations may not be reflected in IEPs written before that time. Consequently, these findings may not describe all that takes place in a school or community to promote successful transition outcomes.

A review of IEPs was initiated as a part of the HJR#4 study to obtain information about the types of transition and adult services being recommended for youth with disabilities by Individual Education Program (IEP) committees. The information compiled provides important feedback about the range of services students with disabilities will need upon exiting special education programs. In addition, this review provides a background regarding Virginia localities' implementation of the transition legislation and offers suggestions for ongoing support, training, and technical assistance.

Methodology

A review of IEPs of secondary special education students was conducted during the summer months of 1993 by the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTC) of Virginia Commonwealth University. An IEP review instrument was developed to enable the data collection to be conducted systematically across school divisions (APPENDIX C).

Fourteen school divisions, representing a non-random sample of urban, rural, and suburban schools, provided on-site access to the IEPS of secondary students enrolled in special education. A total of 238 IEPs were reviewed. Seventy-seven percent of the IEPS reviewed were for students between 16-20 years of age and in grade 10 or above. Eleven categories of disabilities were represented by this sample:

- 42% of IEPS reviewed were for students with specific learning disability.
- 32% of IEPs reviewed were for students with mental retardation.
- 15% of IEPs reviewed were for students with serious emotional disturbance
- The remaining 11% of IEPS reviewed represented the disability areas of autism, orthopedic impairment, speech language impairment, hard of hearing, visual impairment, multiple disabilities, other health impaired, and severely profoundly retarded.

Findings

Participation in Transition Planning

Parents or guardians (76%) and special education teachers (82%) were the most commonly found participants in IEP meetings for these students. It is encouraging to note that 45% of the IEPs were signed by the student suggesting that many localities have implemented the policy of including students in their IEPs for transition planning. School counselors (22%), special education administrators (25%), or school administrators (17%) participated in some of these meetings.

Few vocational educators actually attended or signed any of the IEPs reviewed (8%). Of those IEPs showing students enrolled in regular vocational education programs (39%), 96% showed no participation by vocational education in the development of the IEP.

Likewise, relatively few IEPs were signed by representatives of the adult service community. When present, representatives of the Department of Rehabilitative Services (8%) and the Community Services Boards (7%) were the more common participants from adult services.

Identified Transition Services

Approximately 40% of the 238 IEPs reviewed did not include any recommendations for specific adult services or postsecondary options.

Employment Plans

Interestingly, career objectives were judged to be included less often for older students than for students who were beginning their high school career. For example, 60% of the IEPs for students in grades 8-10 specified general career objectives whereas only 27% of the IEPs for students in grades 11-12 or in ungraded programs included clear career objectives.

Forty-three percent (43%) of the IEPs identified postsecondary employment options. About half of these identified full time employment as a post-school goal and about one third identified supported employment as the desired post-school employment goal.

Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the IEPs reviewed indicated that the youth was participating in regular vocational education programs. Eighteen percent (18%) reported participation in special vocational education programs. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the IEPs reviewed indicated that students were enrolled in a community based work experience program.

Education Plans

Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the IEPs identified post-school educational setting options. Forty-eight percent (48%) of those identifying options specified trade/proprietary/ technical training. Forty-seven percent (47%) of the identified options were for either a four year or community college with community colleges being more commonly named (30%). Apprenticeships were identified options for only 4 of these 238 students (5%).

Independent Living Plans

In the area of independent living, anticipated living arrangements were the most commonly referenced outcome with 44% of the IEPs including this reference. Most IEPs reflected an anticipation of continuing to live with the family; twenty-five percent (25%) identified supervised living as a desired outcome.

Nineteen percent (19%) of the IEPs addressed the anticipation of needed income and support. A little less than half of these indicated that no supports were anticipated. Those identifying anticipated needed supports named the use of Social Security Income as a support option.

Transportation was identified on 18% of the IEPs reviewed. Almost half indicated the goal of licensed driver; the other half would be dependent on public transportation or specialized transportation.

Only 10% addressed recreation issues with the majority indicating participation in self-directed recreation activities. Four percent (4%) of the IEPs addressed medical options such as insurance or individual options such as counseling.

Adult Agency Services Identified

Thirty-two percent (32%) of the IEPs identified specific adult service agencies on the transition component of the IEP.

Of those that incorporated adult agency services as part of the transition planning: 19% identified DRS as a specific agency for transition services; 4% identified Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center (WWRC), a DRS facility, on the transition plan; 3% specified Job Training Partnership Act programs; 2% specified Community Services Boards (mental health or mental retardation services); and 1% identified the Virginia Employment Commission.

Implications of the Review of Individual Education Program Transition Components

Full-time employment appears to be a desired outcome upon school exit for many students with disabilities. Nonetheless, transition plans are not yet articulating a path towards that goal, nor identifying the supports to achieve that goal.

Coordination and planning for employment may take place beyond the scope of what is presented on IEPs. However, current formal transition plans do not reflect involvement of the necessary education personnel and adult services staff in the planning process for post-school employment options. Further, transition plans are not including the strategies that might support the achievement of this desired outcome.

Supported employment was also identified as a desired outcome on many of the IEPs. Supported employment was identified much more frequently than sheltered employment, indicating the trend toward seeking competitive employment for individuals with more severe disabilities. Yet, few adult service representatives who would be the ongoing providers of such services were participants in the planning for these students.

A significant portion of post-school plans for youth with disabilities include postsecondary education options. School counselors participated in 22% of these IEPs. Counselors are instrumental in course selection, assisting in standardized testing participation, as well as identifying college options and opportunities.

Postsecondary education supports are available to young adults in college; reasonable accommodations must be made in any postsecondary training institution, including proprietary schools. However, individuals with disabilities must seek the assistance on their own. A community college representative participated in only one of these IEP meetings. It is not clear that IEPs are being used to develop the self-advocacy

skills these young adults will need to obtain supports when needed or to forge the necessary linkages prior to school exit.

Although supervised living was considered a desired independent living outcome for many of the students whose IEPs were reviewed, few IEPs actually included the participation of adult service agency representatives that could link individuals with these living situations.

The findings of this review reveal that the transition planning process and the development of the transition component of IEPs are still evolving in the Commonwealth. It would be anticipated that the attention to the details of transition planning and service provision would increase with the implementation of IDEA. Local education agencies, local adult service providers, and members of the community including families of youth with disabilities will need to work together to develop practices that promote the intent of this legislation.

CHAPTER 5 - SURVEY OF SELECTED STATE AGENCIES' INFORMATION SYSTEMS: PROCEDURES OF MAINTAINING AND USING DATA ON INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Background for Phase II - Study C

Adult service and employment agencies offer potential supports for young adults with disabilities preparing to exit school and enter employment, education, and independent living settings. Consistently, data show that many of these services are not fully accessed by individuals with disabilities. On the other hand, reports by consumers and service providers claim that services are inadequate and that waiting lists are the norm. Few systems report the utilization of services or the success rates of these services. The legislation authorizing this study, House Joint Resolution #4, specified that recommendations be made for facilitating the transition of youth with disabilities to the adult service system and to identify ways of targeting individuals who may have vocational potential or who may need long-term rehabilitation services. Study C was initiated to explore the status of state agency data collection and information exchange that might contribute to or inhibit these objectives.

Specifically, the study hoped to:

- identify potential sources of linkages between agencies offering services to youth and young adults with disabilities;
- identify means of targeting individual youth for specific agency support;
- identify the extent and use of long range service planning, and
- explore data systems as a source of transition services program outcome evaluation.

Sample and Methodology

This study was conducted during the winter of 1993 by the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center of Virginia Commonwealth University. A survey (APPENDIX D) of information systems representatives was completed by representatives of the following 14 state agencies:

- Department of Education (DOE)
- Department of Rehabilitative Services (DRS)

- Department of Visually Handicapped (DVH)
- Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DDHH)
- Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, & Substance Abuse Services (DMHMRSAS)
- Department of Social Services (DSS)
- Department for the Rights of Virginians with Disabilities (DRVD)
- Department of Correctional Education (DCE)
- Department of Youth & Family Services (DYFS)
- Virginia Employment Commission (VEC)
- Governor's Employment & Training Department (GETD)
- State Council of Higher Education (SCHEV)
- Virginia Community College System (VCCS)
- Social Security Administration (SSA)

Findings

Most agencies maintain one or more centralized information system to track individuals, perform cost accounting, or for federal monitoring. The DCE does not maintain a centralized data system. Four agencies, SCHEV, DOE, GETD, and VEC, reported one centralized system; DRVD reported two; three agencies, DSS, DVH, and SSA, reported having three systems; DDHH maintains four databases; DYFS maintains five; DRS reported seven; and DMHMRSAS reported eight. The largest number of systems maintained by an agency was VCCS with twelve.

Of the thirteen agencies reporting centralized databases, ten of these agencies reported that their information systems had the capability to identify those individuals served who possess one or more disabling conditions. The SCHEV and VCCS reported that they are unable to do so, and the DSS indicated that the information is maintained, but its reliability is questionable.

Twelve of the fourteen agencies reported that they received requests for information or data summaries on a regular basis, frequently naming the other agencies included within this survey. Agencies reported that typically they could respond to specialized requests within a month of receipt. Typically only aggregated information about individuals is shared.

The agencies were asked to identify what strategies are used to identify or project the number of individuals with disabilities, particularly for those individuals exiting public schools who will be eligible for and in need of services provided by their agency. Eight of the agencies

responded that no strategies were used to project future service needs. Of those agencies that do make projections, DVH and DDHH use national prevalence estimates and not specific Virginia data. The SSA reported that they conduct outreach with the DOE regarding SSI benefits for children with disabilities, and the VEC obtains information through state interagency agreements. The GETD receives information from localities through their Job Training Plans. The DCE uses information provided by DYFS and DOC. The DOE stated that projections are not done except in the JTPA 8% program and they use general census data and local school surveys.

Only half of the agencies which provide services have conducted any type of needs assessment during the past three years which addressed the number of individuals needing services and the type of services required. For the most part, these assessments were service specific and not a general assessment.

Most of the agencies providing eligibility based services do not maintain service specific waiting lists for eligible clients either on the state or local level. The GETD believes that some local programs may have waiting lists. The DMHMRSAS reported that some, not all, localities maintain waiting lists for specific services. Each program within DSS maintains waiting lists differently and, in some cases, the state keeps the waiting lists. Most waiting lists are maintained manually.

Most agencies do not compute the costs of providing specific services to specific consumers.

Implications of Survey of State Agencies' Information Systems Findings

A significant amount of energy and resources are put into multiple agencies to maintain data information systems for youth with disabilities. It is not clear, at present, how effectively these data are being used for program planning or program evaluation.

There is no systematic plan for information exchange or projections for planning on the part of state agencies offering services to youth and young adults with disabilities. At present, long range planning may be hindered by the lack of systematic waiting systems that project time between referral, eligibility, and service provision by adult agencies.

Agencies do share aggregate information about individuals with disabilities on request and have an agency procedure for doing so, including maintaining individual confidentiality rights and procedures. However, there are not specific plans or agreements in place regarding the exchange of this information for coordinated long range planning or evaluation purposes.

Most agencies do not forecast the number of individuals with disabilities who will be eligible for and in need of services provided by their agency in future years. State and local information systems present as a source of information about youth and young adults with disabilities. Systematic and accurate information exchange and long term projections could assist in targeting the resources needed to provide services directed toward increasing vocational potential or to provide long term services.

CHAPTER 6 - CONCLUSIONS

The transition initiative for youth with disabilities evolved from the belief that all persons have the right to work and live as independently as possible within their communities. Furthermore, former United States Assistant Secretary of Education, Madeline Will (1984) stated that the culmination of the education of youth with disabilities should be an ability to enter into adult independence. The role of education is to provide these children and youth with the opportunities to develop these skills. Transition services and service delivery systems are directed towards achieving these outcomes.

This study found that youth and young adults with disabilities in Virginia experience outcomes similar to those reported in the national literature although Virginia youth do achieve higher rates of school completion than what is reported nationally. Still, high drop-out rates are found for these students, particularly students with severe emotional disturbance. Youth who drop-out, regardless of disability, face poorer post-school outcomes. While in school, youth who drop-out do not receive the degree of transition services as students who remain in school. Females with disabilities, particularly minority females, are at a high risk for dropping out of school. Youth who drop out of school are less likely to reconnect with the existing service system.

Youth with multiple disabilities and severe retardation frequently remain in school through the maximum age of eligibility (age 22). These youth face the greatest barriers to employment, housing, transportation and independent living upon school exit. Many of these individuals do not receive transition services directed to these areas while in school or upon school exit. Virginia's schools need to address the development of programs and the linkages that are needed that prepare these youth for integration into the adult community.

Achieving independence is predicated on having the ability to support or contribute to one's upkeep. About 75% of the young adults with disabilities held jobs at some time since school exit, but only 57% were employed (range = 37% to 74%) at the time of the survey (Table 3). Most of the jobs were part-time and few paid more than minimum wage. Students with multiple and severe disabilities (54%), mental retardation (45%) and students with serious emotional

disturbance (49%) encounter the highest rates of unemployment or lack of involvement in postsecondary education or training. Most young adults who were employed found jobs on their own or with the help of family and friends and did not use the available adult services in finding employment. Transition services systems must articulate the continuum of services and linkages needed to improve employment outcomes for these youth.

Little comparative data are available for the general non-disabled population. The Virginia Vocational Education Student Follow-up of 1991 Vocational Education Program Completers provides some comparisons. That study found that 70% of the vocational completer respondents were employed or in the military, 20% were in school full time, and 10% were not employed or in school. The average wage for these young adults was above minimum wage with more individuals employed full time than part time. In comparison, youth with disabilities encounter poorer employment outcomes in terms of employment rates, hours, and wages. Although progress has been made in the provision of vocational education to youth with disabilities, these youth must be educated in skilled occupational areas and acquire the competencies needed to compete. Vocational educators, special educators, and general educators must work together to accomplish these goals.

Youth and young adults with disabilities in Virginia do participate in postsecondary education programs at higher rates than reported in other areas of the country. In fact, community college participation is similar to that projected by the general population. Retention of young adults with disabilities in postsecondary education programs is a concern. These young adults with disabilities do not consistently access the support services available within postsecondary education settings that would assist in successful completion of programs. Virginia colleges and universities need to take a proactive stance in assuring access and success for those students requiring accommodations and support.

Efforts to implement consistent statewide transition planning for youth with disabilities are underway across the Commonwealth. However, linkages between school and adult services to foster an uninterrupted transition are not fully established. Youth and young adults do not access post-school supports or services at high rates. In addition, projections of anticipated service needs, systematic data exchange between agencies, and long range planning for service provision are not yet common practice across service providers. Consequently, gaps exist between needed services and available

services. This exchange of information is critical at the local level where resources are allocated annually. Local intercommunity transition councils as well as state policy makers should articulate the need for information exchange and use these data for program evaluation and planning. Only then, can we begin to address the disparity of services offered across the Commonwealth.

Secondary and postsecondary transition service provision remains somewhat fragmented across Virginia with multiple providers offering services with differing eligibility criteria. Understanding and accessing the system present challenges. In addition, stakeholders such as employers and other community members have a role in facilitating the transition to employment or independent living. Efforts to create a collaborative community process to develop and improve the system and its services are critical.

School to work transition is an initiative that is now gaining emphasis within general and vocational education. The proposed process of integrating academics, work based learning, and creating connections between these components and the world of work parallels the transition initiative for youth and young adults with disabilities. It is imperative that Virginia's transition system evolve together where the identification of needed supports for youth with disabilities becomes integral to the total system.

This report provides baseline data for the Commonwealth on the post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities. The results illustrate that differing and individualized supports will be needed. Disability needs, manner of school exit, and gender are factors that may influence program development and priorities. Common elements for all youth include the need for linkages, the need for information, the need for planning to occur, and the need to begin planning early. The following recommendations can serve to continue the momentum of effective transition services that the Commonwealth has historically maintained.

Recommendations

- **RECOMMENDATION I - The Department of Education should recommend amending the Standards of Quality to clarify the responsibilities of local education agencies in the development of transition plans for students eligible for special education, and in the establishment of the necessary linkages with all participating agencies.**

  The following addition to the Standards of Quality is suggested:

  §22.1-253.13:1. Standard 1. Basic skills, selected programs, and instructional personnel.
  D. 6. Early identification of ~~handicapped~~ students with disabilities and enrollment of such students in appropriate instructional programs consistent with state and federal law. The Individualized Education Program for each student, beginning no later than age 16, must include a statement of the needed transition services including, if appropriate, a statement of the responsibilities or linkages of each public agency before the students leave the school setting.

  - The Individual Education Program planning for transition needs to reflect a systematic and carefully planned sequence of educational and community experiences leading to the anticipated post-school outcomes for the student. Inservice and preservice training for educators is critical to making this systemic change. Therefore, the Department of Education, in conjunction with Project UNITE and other state training efforts, should establish statewide training efforts to involve families, students, education colleagues, and, when appropriate, adult service providers in the transition planning and service delivery process.

  - Local education agencies have the responsibility for taking the lead in coordinating interagency linkage activities. Adult agencies, including the Department of Rehabilitative Services, the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, & Substance Abuse Services through Community Service Boards, the Department of Social Services, the Department for the Visually Handicapped, the Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, the Virginia Employment Commission, Job Training Partnership Administration, Virginia Community Colleges, and Institutes of Higher Education, need to identify the

liaison for their agency, office, or institution to participate in the active transition planning for youth preparing to exit secondary education.

- Local school divisions, adult service agencies, and members of the community including business and industry across Virginia should initiate plans to establish the formal linkages, such as local transition councils, needed to ensure the development of vocational assessment, vocational counseling, employment training, and employment options for all youth with disabilities. Technical assistance through Project UNITE can assist in establishing these structures.

- **JUSTIFICATION**

  - **Transition planning needs improvement**
  Local school divisions are not using the Individualized Transition Plan as a cooperative planning tool to guide students' through the transition from school to post-school education or employment. Other community agencies are infrequently involved in transition planning. The ITPs provide little planning for specific adult services.

  - **Linkages with in-school and post-school services are lacking**
  Currently, many young adults with disabilities who would benefit from services are not being connected to the post-school services that exist that would aid them in finding employment, living independently, or experiencing success in education and training programs. In addition, school personnel who provide services are not consistently active partners in this process.

  - **Entitlement versus eligibility**
  Youth with disabilities in public schools are entitled to services. However, families and students must seek and request eligibility for post-school services. It is imperative for them to become knowledgeable of services and the process for accessing these services.

- **RECOMMENDATION II - The Department of Rehabilitative Services (DRS) in cooperation with the Department of Education (DOE) should evaluate model local cooperative agreements for transition services. The effectiveness of these agreements in promoting coordinated transition services for youth with disabilities should be reported to the heads of each of these respective agencies.**

- State and local agencies should explore a variety of options for informing families and consumers regarding available post-school services. Opportunities to receive this information should be made available while youth with disabilities are in school. In addition, methods for providing ongoing information regarding adult services through varied media and locations, such as the local library or public service announcements, should be established.

- Agencies should collaborate to develop service options that enable families and consumers to access available transition services and to move through the multiple systems that offer these services with ease.

JUSTIFICATION

▸ **Gaps in necessary services options**
Services are needed, especially, to meet the complex transition service needs for youth with emotional disturbance, multiple disabilities, and severe disabilities.

▸ **Availability, access and quality of services a function of local decisions**
Service needs vary across the Commonwealth as do methods of developing solutions. To meet the individual needs of students, localities must examine the unique resources and challenges of that locality.

▸ **Fragmented and complex service system**
Multiple agencies provide multiple services to individuals with varying disabilities. Referral and eligibility for one service does not always lead to referral and eligibility for the next logical step. Accessing and negotiating this system is complex for service providers and for families and consumers.

RECOMMENDATION III - Proposed efforts to develop a School to Work transition system for all students in the Commonwealth should be coordinated with current efforts to develop a transition services system for youth with disabilities by Virginia's Intercommunity Transition Council through Project UNITE. State efforts in this regard include: recommendations of the 1993 Department of Education legislative study (SJR #183) on School to Work Transition Programs; state application for funding of a development grant under the proposed federal School to

Work Opportunities Act; and recommendations of the Virginia Workforce Leadership Council. Adequate resources to provide the programs and supports needed for youth with disabilities should be provided.

□ Increased opportunities for in-school work based learning and community based instruction should be made available for youth with disabilities. In addition, options for providing job placement and follow along by in-school and/or post-school personnel should be developed.

□ Educators should ensure that students with disabilities receive the in-school transition services necessary to lead to their transition goals and career objectives. All students receiving special education require this attention, but increased emphasis should be given to students with severe disabilities. Important in-school transition services include, but are not limited to:

- community experiences, including work related experiences
- instruction relevant to career and academic goals
- linkages with post-school support systems, when appropriate

□ Ongoing post-school transition services must be developed to offer continued support and options, particularly to those young adults with complex needs. Adequate resources need to be made available to these adult agencies and programs in order to develop this aspect of the transition service system.

□ Job placement and retention supports for young adults with disabilities should be strengthened. In-school supports should include linkages with employers to promote acquisition of work and academic competencies. Post-school supports should include a system of follow-along and easy re-entry to agency support when job change or advancement occurs.

□ Methods for offering increased work experience and employment opportunities for young adults with severe disabilities should be explored. <u>Supported employment opportunities should be increased for these youth while in school as well as post school</u>. Adequate resources need to be available to offer these services in localities that currently do not have them.

JUSTIFICATION

▸ School to work transition national initiative
Increasing emphasis is being place on school to work transition for all students. The evolution of this proposed system and the transition system for youth with disabilities should be integrated and not separated.

▸ Unemployment
Unemployment rates for youth with disabilities in Virginia are high. This is particularly true for young adults with mental retardation, severe disabilities, and for young adults with serious emotional disturbance.

Full time employment appears to be a desired post-school employment of many youth with disabilities. To realize this goal, secondary education programs, in partnership with the business and industry and employment training organizations of the community, must develop those academic and work skills needed for these youth to enter the labor force.

▸Inconsistent transition services participation and recommendations
Use of in-school and post-school transition services varies across disabilities as well as localities. For example, students with severe emotional disturbance minimally participate in work adjustment programs and few are referred to adult mental health services.

▸ Job seeking and job keeping
Most youth with disabilities find jobs on their own or through families or friends. Few use employment services or adult services. These services were identified as needed.

▸ Supported employment as a viable service
Supported employment has been demonstrated as an effective approach to increasing work opportunities for individuals with severe disabilities. Opportunities to participate in supported employment settings vary across the Commonwealth. Increasing the options for supported employment, particularly in those localities that do not currently operate programs, would benefit youth with severe disabilities.

▸ Work experience and employment outcomes
National data support the link between high school employment and post-school employment for youth with

disabilities. School to work transition research supports the value of linking these high school employment experiences with the academic and vocational competencies of the school curriculum.

- **RECOMMENDATION IV - The Department of Education should evaluate the effectiveness of early transition planning and services for youth with disabilities as a drop-out prevention strategy.**

  - Transition planning and service provision for youth with disabilities should be initiated prior to the federally mandated age of 16, with the final year of middle school being the logical time for initiation. The impact of early initiation for youth with disabilities should be evaluated using those school divisions that initiate transition planning prior to the required age. Project UNITE offers an outcome evaluation tool that can be used for this purpose.

  - Youth with disabilities, particularly females with disabilities and all youth with serious emotional disturbance, should be targeted as one priority for the Department of Education drop-out prevention efforts.

  - School re-entry or alternative academic programs should be developed and marketed by local education agencies with support by the Department of Education. These programs should enable youth with disabilities who drop-out of school to re-enter public education to complete their academic and vocational programs with special education support as needed.

- **JUSTIFICATION**

  - **Drop-out rates**

Youth with disabilities drop-out of school at an alarmingly high rate. These youth begin to drop out as early as age 14. Transition planning and services are potential prevention tools.

Almost 50% of those youth with serious emotional disturbance leave school without a diploma. This apparent correlation between disability and dropping out of school demands our attention.

Females with disabilities pose a high risk of dropping out of school. In addition, minority females with

disabilities are the least likely to receive a diploma. This fact too, demands an examination of what we do and what we can do differently in schools to prevent these occurrences.

▸ **Outcomes for youth with disabilities who drop out of school**

Youth with disabilities who drop out of school are more likely to face post-school employment and education barriers than youth who receive diplomas. They are more likely to have families, receive social assistance, and be involved with the court system. These youth do not receive in-school transition services to the same degree as youth who receive diplomas or remain in school to receive certificates or special diplomas. Dropouts constituted a high percentage of the nonrespondents to the follow-up survey suggesting that these individuals disconnect from the system, making linkages with needed services difficult. Longitudinal studies show that youth who drop out fall further behind with time in terms of post-school success measures. These individuals need programs that enable them to acquire the education and training to improve their chances for success.

■ **RECOMMENDATION V - The Board of Education should establish a study group consisting of representatives from the State Council on Higher Education, Virginia Community College System, secondary school counselors, the Department of Education and local education agencies, and the Department of Rehabilitative Services, as well as students with disabilities participating in postsecondary education to identify and recommend programs and strategies to increase the success of young adults with disabilities in postsecondary education programs.**

□ Programs to provide orientation to young adults with disabilities attending postsecondary education programs should be developed and supported. These programs could assist the student in linking with the support services available.

□ Secondary schools and postsecondary education institutions should provide prospective postsecondary students with disabilities and their families with information regarding accessing support services to assist in achieving postsecondary education goals of the students.

- **JUSTIFICATION**

  - **Postsecondary education participation**

Virginia youth with disabilities participate in postsecondary education at higher rates than other youth with disabilities nationally. Many of these students do not use the support services available. In addition, retention of these students in postsecondary education programs presents a challenge.

- Few Individual Education Program meetings are attended by in-school personnel such as guidance counselors or postsecondary education resource personnel. These personnel could assist youth and their families clarify the programs needed while in secondary education and the supports available to assist the young adult in the post-school education or training setting.

- **Future expectations**

The jobs of the future will require additional training after high school. Youth with disabilities need to be aware of the support options available to them to enter or re-enter training and be successful.

- **RECOMMENDATION VI - The Department of Education should create an interagency work group to develop and evaluate a system of data collection and information exchange that promotes the provision of quality data to project postsecondary transition service needs for youth and young adults with disabilities.**

The Department of Education, in collaboration with the Departments of Rehabilitative Services, Visually Handicapped, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Mental Health, Mental Retardation, & Substance Abuse Services, as well as the Virginia Community College System and State Council on Higher Education should evaluate the benefits and costs of developing and refining a data system that can identify or project the number of students with disabilities who will be eligible for and in need of post-school transition services upon exiting schools.

- Evaluation should also address inclusion of students with disabilities not receiving special education or related services.
- This system should enable access by adult service agencies to the information needed to develop programs to facilitate the transition of youth with disabilities.

The resources of Project UNITE, a Department of Education and Department of Rehabilitative Services collaborative transition services implementation project can be used to pilot this system, reporting these findings to the General Assembly biannually.

- In the revision of the K-6 Special Education Data Collection System of the Department of Education, the DOE team should examine the extent to which data can be collected that will provide long term projections for use by other agencies in service development and planning.

- Each agency providing adult services, including agencies representing post-secondary education, should maintain a database that can reliably identify people with disabilities served through the agency programs. Specific agencies whose data systems are currently unable to identify this level of information should explore effective mechanisms for aggregating these data through a central state agency or on the local level. Each agency maintaining aggregate data on youth and young adults with disabilities should establish a plan outlining the mechanism(s) for information exchange. The agencies should develop complementary systems for information exchange.

- Agencies providing adult services to young adults with disabilities should maintain waiting lists of those clients found eligible for specific services but are waiting for space in these programs. These waiting lists should be updated annually. Consumers or family members should have access to specific information about the status of their application for services upon their request.

- **JUSTIFICATION**

  - **Long range planning to target service development**

No systematic method of data gathering, sharing and projecting across child and adult service agencies exists, at either the state or local levels. Service providers cannot effectively forecast the need for services and complete long-range planning without an adequate base of data. The primary source of data on youth with disabilities exiting secondary systems rests within state and local education agencies. The primary audience for the data is the adult service agencies.

▸ **Information sharing**
Although agencies do share information on request, the availability of information varies. The lack of a plan or complementary system for information exchange inhibits the ability of agencies to predict or identify needed long term adult services.

▸ **Evaluation of outcomes**
Efforts to improve transition services should be evaluated based on successful consumer outcomes. Project UNITE, a collaborative project of the Department of Education and Department of Rehabilitative Services, is piloting a program to collect transition services outcome data.

▸ **Inconsistency of Maintaining Waiting lists**
Most adult service agencies do not maintain lists of persons who are eligible for services but are waiting for space within programs. Of those that do maintain lists, it is unclear as how these lists are maintained or used.

Waiting lists provide valuable information regarding demand for services on the part of the consumer, and the available resources within the agencies.

■ **RECOMMENDATION VII - The Board of Education, the Department of Education, and all Local Education Agencies should solicit information from consumers and families concerning the effectiveness of secondary transition programs and services for youth with disabilities.**

□ Methods for expanding consumer input and the feasibility for their implementation could be evaluated through the interagency activities of Project UNITE. Open forums and public comment periods sponsored by the Virginia Intercommunity Transition Council should be one mechanism to increase consumer participation into the design of secondary and adult services. The annual report prepared by the Transition Council will include the synopsis of public comment.

◘ **JUSTIFICATION**

▸ **Responsive services**
The ability of agencies to provide services that are responsive to the consumers' needs is dependent upon an effective system of gathering and utilizing consumer and

family input. Study results indicate that there is no systematic mechanism to gather such information within and between agencies.

- **Transition specific evaluation**

Although many agencies conduct evaluation studies, agencies have not typically collected specific evaluation data regarding transition services needed, effectiveness of transition services provided, or consumer satisfaction with transition services.

APPENDIX A
1992 GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION #4

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA--1992 SESSION

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Requesting the State Board of Education to study the demographics of students exiting the special education system and to develop recommendations to facilitate the transition of these individuals to the adult rehabilitative services system.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, March 5, 1992
Agreed to by the Senate, March 4, 1992

WHEREAS, more than 4,000 students with disabilities exit Virginia's schools each year; and

WHEREAS, national data on young adults with disabilities who have been out of school for more than one year indicate that 29.2 percent of the young adults work full-time, 17.2 percent work part-time, and only 14.6 percent participate in any postsecondary education or vocational training program; and

WHEREAS, research has found that the majority of young adults with disabilities who have been out of school for more than one year do not access the adult service agency system; and

WHEREAS, some young adults with disabilities require long-term rehabilitation and need multiple and complex services that should be coordinated; and

WHEREAS, Virginia does not possess comprehensive data regarding the employment and independent living status and adult service needs of youth with disabilities who have exited Virginia's schools; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the State Board of Education be requested to study the demographics of students exiting the special education system and to develop recommendations for programs and activities to facilitate the transition of these individuals from special education programs to the adult rehabilitative services system. The recommendations shall include methods of targeting individuals who have vocational potential and individuals who may need long-term rehabilitation services. In conducting its study, the State Board of Education shall consult with parents of children who receive special education services.

The Board of Education shall submit its findings and recommendations to the House Committees on Education and on Health, Welfare and Institutions and to the Senate Committee on Education and Health by October 1, 1993, and to the Governor and the 1994 Session of the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents.

APPENDIX B
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A copy of the statewide follow-up survey instrument can be obtained by contacting:

Dr. Susan Asselin, Associate Professor
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Division of Vocational Technical Education
323 Lane Hall
Blacksburg, VA 25061

703-231-8206

APPENDIX C
IEP REVIEW INSTRUMENT

A copy of the Individual Education Program review instrument can be obtained by contacting:

Ms. Elizabeth Getzel
Virginia Commonwealth University
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
1314 West Main Street
P.O. Box 2011
Richmond, VA 23284-2011

804-367-1851

APPENDIX D
STATE DATA SYSTEMS SURVEY

A copy of the State Data Systems Survey instrument can be obtained by contacting:

Dr. John Kregel
Virginia Commonwealth University
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center
1314 West Main Street
P.O. Box 2011
Richmond, VA 23284-2011

804-367-1851

APPENDIX E
REFERENCES

References

United States Department of Education. (1992). Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington DC: Author.

Virginia Department of Education. (1991). Superintendent's Annual Report for Virginia. Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Education. (1992). Vocational Education Students Follow-Up. Richmond, VA: Author

Wagner. M. (1989). The Transition Experiences of Youth with Disabilities: A Report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Wagner, M. (1993). Trends in Postschool Outcomes of Youth with Disabilities. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Will, M. (1984). OSERS programming for the transition of youth with disabilities: Bridges from school to working life. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.